

US Serial No. 10/574426
Page 6 of 12

Remarks:

Amendments to the claims:

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 9-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 11, 15-18, 20-23 and 25 are amended, and claims 4, 7 and 8 are canceled. Claim 25 is amended to address a claim objection and correct typographical errors. Claims 6, 11, 16 and 20-22 are amended to address a claim rejection under 35 USC 112 and correct typographical errors.

No new matter is added to the application by this Amendment. The features added to claims 1 and 15 find support in the present specification, as originally filed, at, for example, paragraph [0026] of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0293211 A1 (hereinafter "the '211 publication") for the present application. The features added to claim 6 finds support in the present specification, as originally filed, at, for example, paragraph [0024] of the '211 publication.

Regarding the objections of claims 4 and 25 for allegedly informalities:

Applicants respectfully traverse the objections of the foregoing claims. In view of the cancellation of claim 4, this objection is moot with respect to that claim. Claim 25 was amended to delete the first unnecessary period from the claim as requested by the Patent Office. Applicants submit that the amendment to claim 25 overcomes the claim objections as set forth in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding objections to the claims.

Regarding the rejections of claims 6, 11 and 16-25 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph:

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the foregoing claims.

In response to these rejections, claim 6 was amended to replace the acronym "PEG" with the phrase "polyethylene glycol"; claim 11 was amended to remove the word "formulation"; claim 16 was amended to replace the word "constituent" with the word "component" and provide antecedent basis for the features recited therein; claim 20 was

US Serial No. 10/574426
Page 7 of 12

amended to replace the phrase "lubricant component(s)" with the phrase "at least one lubricant component"; and claims 21 and 22 were amended to remove the word "system".

Applicants submit that amended claims 6, 11, 16 and 19-22 are definite and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Additionally, Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 6, 11, 16 and 19-22 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 6, 11 and 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-8, 12, 15, 16, 18 and 19 under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,987,484 to Lundberg et al. (hereinafter "Lundberg"):

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the foregoing claims in view of Lundberg.

Prior to discussing the relative merits of the Examiner's rejection, Applicants point out that unpatentability based on "anticipation" type rejection under 35 USC 102 requires that the invention is not in fact new. See *Hoover Group, Inc. v. Custom Metalcraft, Inc.*, 66 F.3d 299, 302, 36 USPQ2d 1101, 1103 (Fed. Cir. 1995) ("lack of novelty (often called 'anticipation') requires that the same invention, including each element and limitation of the claims, was known or used by others before it was invented by the patentee"). Anticipation requires that a *single reference* [emphasis added] describe the claimed invention with sufficient precision and detail to establish that the subject matter existed in the prior art. See, *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The principle of "inherency," in the law of anticipation, requires that any information missing from the reference would nonetheless be known to be present in the subject matter of the reference, when viewed by persons experienced in the field of the invention.

US Serial No. 10/574426
Page 8 of 12

However, "anticipation by inherent disclosure is appropriate only when the reference discloses prior art that must necessarily include the unstated limitation, [or the reference] cannot inherently anticipate the claims." *Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs., Inc.*, 290 F.3d 1364, 1373 [62 USPQ2d 1865] (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Hitzeman v. Rutter*, 243 F.3d 1345, 1355 [58 USPQ2d 1161] (Fed. Cir. 2001) ("consistent with the law of anticipation, an inherent property must necessarily be present in the invention described by the count, and it must be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill in the art"); *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745 [49 USPQ2d 1949] (Fed. Cir. 1999) (that a feature in the prior art reference "could" operate as claimed does not establish inherency).

Thus, when a claim limitation is not explicitly set forth in a reference, evidence "must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill." *Continental Can Co.*, 948 F.2d at 1268. It is not sufficient if a material element or limitation is "merely probably or possibly present" in the prior art. *Trintec Indus., Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 1295 [63 USPQ2d 1597] (Fed. Cir. 2002). See also, *W.L. Gore v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d at 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (anticipation "cannot be predicated on mere conjecture respecting the characteristics of products that might result from the practice of processes disclosed in references"); *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581 [212 USPQ 323] (CCPA 1982) (to anticipate, the asserted inherent function must be present in the prior art).

With respect to independent claims 1 and 15, the Patent Office alleges that Lundberg teaches each and every feature recited therein. Applicants respectfully disagree with these allegations by the Patent Office.

Nowhere does Lundberg disclose a detergent body containing a high proportion of a solid component, wherein the detergent body is produced in an injection molding process, wherein a solid content for the solid component is at least 65 wt% of the detergent body as required by amended claim 1. Moreover, Lundberg fails to disclose a process for producing a detergent body having a high proportion of a solid component, wherein the

US Serial No. 10/574426
Page 9 of 12

process comprises injection molding, wherein a solid content for the solid component is at the lower amount of at least 50 wt% of the detergent body as recited in amended claim 15.

Instead, Lundberg discloses closed die molding of a detergent bar and closed die molding of a substantially non-soap synthetic detergent composition in the form of a toilet bar. However, the Lundberg's closed die molding does not teach or suggest injection molding as required by claim 15.

Furthermore, in examples 1-29 of Lundberg, the detergent bars formed by Lundberg's closed die molding process do not include more than 55.3% detergent. Thus, Lundberg does not teach or suggest a detergent body having a solid content of at least 65 wt% of the detergent body as required by claim 1.

Because these features of independent claims 1 and 15 are not disclosed by Lundberg, Lundberg cannot anticipate, nor would not have rendered obvious, the features specifically defined in claims 1 and 15 and their dependent claims.

For at least these reasons, claims 1-8, 12, 15, 16, 18 and 19 are patentably distinct and also nonobvious in view of Lundberg. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-8 and 11-25 under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,224,812 to Allan et al. (hereinafter "Allan"):
Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the foregoing claims in view of Allan.

With respect to independent claims 1, 14 and 15, the Patent Office alleges that Allan teaches each and every feature recited therein. Applicants respectfully disagree with these allegations by the Patent Office.

US Serial No. 10/574426
Page 10 of 12

Nowhere does Allan disclose a detergent body containing a high proportion of a solid component, wherein said detergent body is produced in an injection molding process, wherein a solid content of the solid component is at least 65 wt% of the detergent body as required by amended claim 1 and claim 14. Also, Allan fails to disclose a process for producing a detergent body having a high proportion of a solid component, wherein the process comprises injection molding, wherein a solid content of the solid component is at least 50 wt% of the detergent body as recited in amended claim 15.

Because these features of independent claims 1, 14 and 15 are not disclosed by Allan, Allan cannot anticipate, nor would not have rendered obvious, the features specifically defined in claims 1 and 15 and their dependent claims as now amended and presented in this paper.

For at least these reasons, claims 1-8 and 11-25 are patentably distinct from and/or non-obvious in view of Allan. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claims 9 and 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allan in view of WO 01/88079, equivalent to US 7256168 to Raehse (hereinafter "Raehse"):

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the foregoing claims in view of Allan and Raehse.

The Patent Office acknowledges that Allan does not teach or suggest at least 50 wt% builders like alkali metal citrate salt (see page 6 of the Office Action). The Patent Office introduces Raehse as allegedly teaching a detergent tablet for laundry, prepared by injection molding, which comprises from 10-60 wt% builders, such as, trisodium citrate. The Patent Office alleges that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate builders like trisodium citrate in its optimum proportion into the detergent bar of Allan for fabric wash use because it is known from Raehse that a similar product for fabric wash use comprises such builders like trisodium citrate. Applicants respectfully disagree with these allegations.

US Serial No. 10/574426
Page 11 of 12

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 23 2009

Raehse fails to remedies the deficiencies of Allan as set forth above with respect to claim 1, from which claims 9 and 10 depend. At best, detergent tablets comprising 10 to 60% by weight of one or more substances from the group of builders, acidifying agents, chelating agents, scale-inhibiting polymers or nonionic surfactants (see col. 4, lines 59-61).

Allan and Raehse, taken singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest detergent body containing a high proportion of a solid component, wherein the detergent body is produced in an injection molding process, wherein a solid content for the solid component is at least 65 wt% of the detergent body as recited in claim 1.

Because these features of independent claims 1 are not taught or suggested by Allan and Raehse, taken singly or in combination, the references would not have rendered the features of at least claims 9 and 10 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner in charge of this application believe that telephonic communication with the undersigned would meaningfully advance the prosecution of this application, they are invited to call the undersigned at their earliest convenience. The early issuance of a *Notice of Allowability* is solicited.

PETITION FOR A THREE-MONTH EXTENSION OF TIME

Applicants respectfully petition for a three-month extension of time in order to permit for the timely entry of this response. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263 with respect to this petition.

US Serial No. 10/574426
Page 12 of 12

CONDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR FEES

Should any further fee be required by the Commissioner in order to permit the timely entry of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully Submitted;

Andrew N. Parfomak

Andrew N. Parfomak, Esq.
Reg. No. 32431
Norris, McLaughlin &
Marcus, PA
875 Third Avenue, 18th Fl.
New York, NY 10022
Tel: (212) 808-0700

23 March 2009

Date:

CERTIFICATION OF TELEFAX TRANSMISSION:

I hereby certify that this paper is being telefax transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office to telefax number: 571 273-8300 on the date shown below:

E. Exarhoulias
Evangelina Exarhoulias

March 23, 2009

Date:

C:\VANPCMB\102792\557\Amendment01.DOC